

Remarks

Claims 1-16 are pending. Independent claim 1 has been amended. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application based on the following Remarks are respectfully requested.

Amendment To The Specification

The Applicants have amended the Specification in paragraph [00112] to update the identification of the application that has been incorporated by reference. Applicants submit that no new matter has been added by way of this amendment to the Specification and respectfully request entering of this amendment.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Okitsu (U.S. Patent No. 6,006,005).

Claims 1-10 and 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakagaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,852,474).

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tomita et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,732,372).

Summary Of Response To § 102 Rejections

Applicants respond to these rejections for the reasons summarized here and explained in detail below.

First, Tomita is not a proper 102(b) reference since it was not "patented or described in a printed publication...more than one year prior to the date of the application for patent in the United States."

Second, the Examiner has not met the initial burden of showing the "particular part relied on" in each of the cited references in the Office Action under 37 C.F.R. §1.104.

Third, none of the three references teach or suggest at least the amended claim 1 element of a "response to a current event command that is unaffected by signal interrupts in the system, the schedule command being transmitted at a precise time."

For these reasons, reconsideration of the rejection of independent claim 1, and dependent claims 2-16, is respectfully requested.

Tomita Is Not 102(b) Prior Art

Tomita was patented on May 4, 2004 and published on August 9, 2001. Neither date is more than one year prior to the date of the application of the present application (priority date of July 31, 2001). Tomita is therefore not a proper 102(b) reference and thus the rejection on this basis should be withdrawn. Applicants will nonetheless respond substantively to the Tomita reference below.

The “Particular Part Relied On” For Each Reference Under 37 C.F.R. §1.104 Has Not Been Provided By The Examiner

For each rejection, the Examiner has the initial burden of showing the “particular part relied on” in each of the cited references in the Office Action under 37 C.F.R. §1.104:

(2) In rejecting claims for want of novelty or for obviousness, the examiner must cite the best references at his or her command. When a reference is complex or shows or describes inventions other than that claimed by the applicant, the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as practicable. The pertinence of each reference, if not apparent, must be clearly explained and each rejected claim specified.

37 C.F.R. §1.104(b)(2). In the Office Action, the Examiner makes rejections based on three references: Okitsu, Nakagaki and Tomita. In making these rejections, the Examiner reiterates claim 1 for each reference and then generally provides one to three sentences for each reference with the basis for the rejection, followed by a cite to almost all the columns of each patent cited, excluding the claims (e.g. cols. 2-9 for Okitsu, cols. 3-16 of Nakagaki and cols. 4-17 of Tomita). The one to three sentence provided do not show where each element is found in each reference, and the citation to almost all the columns of each references is not helpful in understanding the Examiner's rejection. Should the Examiner maintain the rejection, the Applicants respectfully request that each element of the claims be found in each of the cited references, by specific column and line number, to better understand the rejection.

Rejection of Claim 1 Under 102(b)

Independent claim 1, as amended, calls for a “method of synchronizing control of one or more devices in a system during an operational cycle” where “the response to the current event command is unaffected by signal interrupts in the system, the schedule command being transmitted at a precise time.”

As stated in the Background section of the present application, the present application overcomes the deficiencies and limitations of the prior art relating to the inability of conventional microprocessors to issue control signals and execute events associated with the operation and control of processing systems at precise times when a signal that consumes the attention of the microprocessor is generated. Application, paragraph [0003]. Such signals are known as interrupts and are usually generated when input/output (I/O) is required. Application, paragraph [0003].

In Okitsu, Nakagaki et al. and Tomita et al., only conventional operating systems are described that generally take control of the processor when an interrupt occurs in order to determine the next action to be taken. Such control is undesirable for the current event undertaken by the processor since it prevents synchronization of control of one or more devices in the system, and the interrupts preclude specific anticipated events from occurring until the interrupt control is completed. As a result, in these prior art systems, the overall efficiency of processing events and of completing operations in general are detrimentally affected.

To clarify this distinction, claim 1 has been amended to specifically include the limitation that "the response to the current event command is unaffected by signal interrupts in the system, said schedule command being transmitted at a precise time."

None of the prior art references, Okitsu, Nakagaki et al. or Tomita et al., includes the limitations of amended claim 1 that "the response to the current event command is unaffected by signal interrupts in the system, the schedule command being transmitted at a precise time." While each of those prior art references teaches systems that attempt to synchronize control of one or more devices in a system, none describes or discloses any method or mechanism for precisely timing signals such that they are unaffected by interrupts to the system. Therefore, amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the Okitsu, Nakagaki et al. or Tomita et al. references and allowance of this claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Dependent Claims 2-16

Claims 2-16 ultimately depend from independent claim 1 and are therefore not anticipated by the cited references for the same reasons as provided above with regard to claim 1. In addition, each of these dependent claims contain additional limitations than those contained in independent claim 1 and the Examiner has provided no basis for rejecting these additional limitations in the Office Action. Should the Examiner maintain the rejection, the Applicants respectfully request that each element of the dependent claims 2-16 be identified in the cited reference, by column and line number, to better understand the rejection.

Conclusion

Therefore, all rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is requested.

Applicants do not believe any fees are needed to accompany this Response.

Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicants at the telephone number indicated below in order to expeditiously resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

MAYER BROWN ROWE & MAW LLP

Date: October 27, 2006

By:



Michael A. Molano
Registration No. 39,777
Direct No. (650) 331-2040

MAYER, BROWN, ROWE & MAW LLP
P.O. Box 2828
Chicago, IL 60690-2828